

INTER-REGIONAL PARTNERSHIP MEETING

Danville Town Meeting Hall

201 Front Street
Danville, CA 94526

Wednesday, May 15, 2002
12:30 p.m.

MEETING SUMMARY

I. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS

Co-chair, Supervisor Mark DeSaulnier, of Contra Costa County called the meeting to order at 12:50 p.m. Mr. DeSaulnier welcomed everyone to Danville and asked the members to introduce themselves. In attendance were:

Inter-Regional Partnership Members

Mayor Dan Bilbrey, City of Tracy
Supervisor Mark DeSaulnier, Contra Costa County
Mayor Richard Dodds, City of Patterson
Council Member Millie Greenberg, Town of Danville
Supervisor Jack Sieglock, San Joaquin County
Council Member Bob Wasserman, City of Fremont
Supervisor Scott Haggerty, Alameda County
Council Member Gloryanna Rhodes, City of Lathrop

Staff to the Inter-Regional Partnership

Alex Amoroso, Principal Planner, Association of Bay Area Governments
Gerry Raycraft, Planning Director, Association of Bay Area Governments
Gary Dickson, Executive Director, Stanislaus Council of Governments
Andrew Chesley, Deputy Executive Director, San Joaquin Council of Governments
Christy Riviere, Regional Planner, Association of Bay Area Governments
Michael Smith, Regional Planner, Association of Bay Area Governments
Stephen VanDenburgh, Senior Regional Planner, San Joaquin Council of Governments
Nicole Gorham, Office Assistant, San Joaquin Council of Governments

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Gloryanna Rhodes stated the minutes did not reflect her attendance at the January meeting, and requested the correction be made. It was moved/seconded (Haggerty/Dodds) to approve the corrected minutes of January 16, 2002. Motion passed by voice vote.

III. IRP STATUS REPORT/PROGRAM REVIEW

Mr. Alex Amoroso briefed the members on the IRP Pilot Project Timeline/Calendar for January 2002 – January 2003. This will be updated periodically to track the progress of the zones, as well as upcoming legislation discussions and new regional issues. He also briefed the members on a NOFA that the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) plans to put out. HCD is hoping to use these funds to facilitate more regional participation in IRPs throughout the state.

He also explained that a legislative calendar would be brought forward at the next meeting to pursue incentives and IRP issues in the current legislative session.

On a side note, ABAG is holding a Construction Defect Litigation Program on May 31st. This is one of the issues that effects people statewide and everyone is welcome to attend.

As this was an information item only, no action was taken.

IV. IRP PROGRAM

- A. Mr. Alex Amoroso introduced Nick Bollman, Chair of the State Speaker's Commission on Regionalism. Mr. Bollman briefed the members the history of the Speaker's Commission and outlined their goal to not create a new layer of government, but to work in collaboration with local governments at a regional level. The commission (comprised of 31 members) came up with a set of recommendations that are outlined in the recently released report. These recommendations suggest how state policies and practices should be reformed and aligned to support regional planning efforts.

Mr. Bollman went on to explain that the commission suggested to the state government that they realign its policies across eight different policy areas and in the realignment the state could encourage and support not only collaboration with local governments but with the state government itself coming to the table as a partner to achieve regional solutions. The eight areas they looked at were state/local finance, economic development, economic strategy, work force development, workforce investment, social equity issues, collaborate regional planning, and schools in communities as centers of the community.

Mr. Haggerty asked how in depth the commission looked into housing and urban limit lines. Mr. Bollman responded that their recommendations included solving state/local finance problems, but didn't take a position on urban limit lines. They felt it was a "false issue" that needs a regional solution. Mr. Haggerty stated that since the state mandates housing, it is not a false issue and requested the commission to look at this issue at the state level.

Mr. Bollman reiterated that a strong recommendation of the committee was to limit the state government's role to goal setting, and incentive making and to keep the seat of power at a regional level.

- B. A discussion was initiated regarding subject areas to pursue in the future. Mr. Bollman was available as a resource for this discussion. The IRP members decided that the issues for future discussion and action should include: Air Quality, Housing Needs, Economic Development, Water Quality, and Transportation. It was suggested that a sub-committee be formed to deal with several issues at once. Staff will consider several different strategies and will bring the top ones forward at the next meeting.

As this was an information item only, no action was taken.

** Supervisor Sieglock arrived during discussion of item #IV.*

V. JOBS/HOUSING OPPORTUNITY ZONE DESIGNATION

- A. Mr. Amoroso stated that the Jobs/Housing Opportunity Zone RFP was re-opened for Alameda and Santa Clara Counties. A total of four proposals were received, three from Alameda County and one from Santa Clara County. He indicated that all four had been reviewed and ranked. (See table for rankings)

<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Average Score</i>	<i>Evaluation Committee Ranking</i>
Alameda County		
Dublin Transit Center	108.23	1
San Lorenzo Village	103.21	2
Union City Intermodal Station Area	91.98	3
Santa Clara County		
City of Milpitas	110.65	1
City of Morgan Hill	77.12	2

He also called attention to a letter that was written by the City of Manteca encouraging the IRP staff to recommend Tara Business Park be designated a Opportunity Zone and requesting an opportunity to make a presentation to the IRP.

Mayor Dodds reported on the Evaluation Committee's scoring and recommendations for the zones. Mr. Dodds indicated the reason the Morgan Hill proposal scored low was because of problems with the growth limitation in the residential development area. They would have to go back to the voters to allow for more residential development. But he shared his concern that it could be approved because only two applications were submitted. He also indicated the reason that Union City scored low was because of the lawsuits that have faced the project. He stated that this would not even be part of the discussion if the application had been submitted on time. The discussion was opened to the public for comments regarding these projects.

- Councilmember Richard Valle, Union City spoke in support of the Union City Intermodal Station Area. Mr. Valle informed the IRP that not only is this a key project for Alameda County but also Santa Clara County, and San Mateo County. This project brings together several regional transportation services

including: Bart, ACE train, AC Transit, Union City Transit, and Capitol Corridor Transit. He also indicated that all court cases have been resolved and that they are ready to go forward.

- Ms. Linda Gardner, Alameda County HCD, indicated that their committee agrees with the ranking as it stands.

Mr. Haggerty stated the committee ranked other projects higher but that he would support the Union City project if any Zones are still available at the end of the process. Mr. Wasserman agreed that this was a worthwhile project but pointed out that a few key components are not in place yet.

Motion was made and seconded (Rhodes/Haggerty) to accept ratings of the top two Alameda projects (Dublin Transit Center & San Lorenzo Village) set forth by committee. Motion passed unanimously.

****Supervisor Haggerty left the meeting at this time.***

Ms. Rhodes indicated that the Morgan Hill project did not meet the criteria set forth in the RFP and that she could not support the project. Discussion regarding this project was opened at this time.

- Mr. Bill Newkirk, City of Morgan Hill, spoke in support of the Morgan Hill project. He stated that the housing component is a key part of this project. It would bring the hub of population closer to transit and is the key to attracting new jobs. The proposition is going before the voters in November. He stated that a timeline is not available at the moment and no specific numbers are available for the dwelling units. They hope to have a direct tie between jobs and housing.

Mayor Dodds agreed that this is a good project but is prematurely based on anticipated voter response to revising the residential growth limits. Mr. Bilbrey indicated that dealing with issues such as housing but promoting primarily jobs does not fit the housing/jobs balance.

Motion was made and seconded (Dodds/Rhodes) to accept the City of Milpitas proposal as the only project for Santa Clara County. Motion passed unanimously.

- B. Mayor Dodds indicated that SJCOG and Alameda County have requested an additional slot. Since one slot is available in Santa Clara County, he suggested that the evaluation committee look at the projects that didn't place and rescore them to select one more. Ms. Rhodes indicated that a previous motion stated that the remaining zones would be re-distributed among existing proposals. The evaluation committee will keep the same members and will meet and rank each previously unselected proposal based on existing and updated material.

Mr. Kyle Kollar, City of Manteca stated that this would be a fair process and thanked the IRP for their consideration.

VI. INCENTIVES REPORT

Mr. Amoroso informed the partnership that the incentives have been prioritized. They include Tax Increment Financing, Enterprise Zone Status, Priority Status for Zones in State Programs, Cash Grants, Priority for Inter-regional Improvement Program funds, and Childcare Assistance. Discussion followed regarding revising AB 499. Mr. Dickson indicated that Assemblyman Cogdill is willing to consider completely amending the bill to focus on designated zones. He is willing to replace incentive language and or incorporate proposed changes into the existing bill. He shared that the proposed language is “generally acceptable”. Mr. Bilbrey felt that the language should be reworked before approaching legislators from the IRP area. It was agreed that language would be finalized before bringing it before other legislators.

Mr. Bruce Kern, East Bay Economic Development Agency, stated that this legislation needs bipartisan support and suggested a dual track administrator to work on securing incentives for these zones.

As this was an information item only, no action was taken.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m. until July 17, 2002.